

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PLAN

FOR

**TECHNICAL SERVICES FOR AEROSPACE SYSTEMS
MODELING AND SIMULATION II**

**NASA Contract
Company Name**

APPROVED BY:

Name / Title

Fee Determination Official

Date

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PLAN FOR TECHNICAL SERVICES FOR AEROSPACE SYSTEMS MODELING AND SIMULATION II

NASA Contract NNA TBD with TBD

Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. Organizational Structure for Award Fee Administration.....	2
1. <i>Fee Determination Official (FDO)</i>	2
2. <i>Performance Evaluation Board (PEB)</i>	2
3. <i>Contract and CTO Performance Monitors</i>	3
III. Evaluation Requirements	3
IV. Method for Determining Award Fee.....	4
V. Changes in Plan Coverage.....	6
1. Right to Make Unilateral Changes	6
2. <i>Changes in Plan Coverage</i>	6
ATTACHMENT III-A	7
ATTACHMENT III-B	8
ATTACHMENT III-C.1	10
ATTACHMENT III-C.2.....	11
ATTACHMENT III-D	17
ATTACHMENT IV-A.....	18
ATTACHMENT IV-B.....	19
1. <i>Monitoring and Assessing Performance</i>	19
2. <i>Documenting Evaluation/Assessment</i>	19

I. Introduction

This plan describes the current performance evaluation process for Contract No. NNA_____ dated _____ 2011, with _____. In accordance with the provisions of RFP NNA10345000R, a Cost-Plus-Award-Fee Contract was awarded. This plan implements the administration of the award fee provisions of that Contract.

1. The Government, in accordance with the procedures set forth below, will determine the amount of Award Fee earned based upon an evaluation of the Contractor's performance. The Award Fee will be used to provide incentive for the Contractor's Management and Technical performance, Timeliness / Schedule, Administrative / Safety / Environment, and Cost for day-to-day activities on the contract and each Contract Task Order (CTO).
2. The following matters, among others, are covered in the Contract:
 - a. The Contractor is required to supply operations, development, maintenance, and modification services of the Simulation Laboratory Facilities at Ames Research Center.
 - b. The base term of the Contract is from _____ through _____.
 - c. The estimated cost of performing the contract is \$ _____
 - d. The base fee is \$0.00
 - e. The estimated cost and Award Fee, including any base fee, are subject to equitable adjustments arising from changes or other contract modifications and will be addressed in the appropriate contract modifications.
 - f. The Award Fee will be determined periodically by the Fee Determination Official (FDO) in accordance with this plan.
 - g. Award Fee determinations are unilateral decisions made solely at the discretion of the Government. Award Fee determinations are not subject to the Disputes clause of the contract.
 - h. The FDO may unilaterally change this plan, as covered in Part V, provided the Contractor receives notice of the changes PRIOR TO the beginning of the evaluation period to which the changes apply. The changes will be made without formal modification of the Contract and will be made by written notice to the Contractor.

II. Organizational Structure for Award Fee Administration

The following organizational structure is established for administering the Award Fee provisions of the subject Contract.

1. Fee Determination Official (FDO)

1. The FDO is the Director for Aeronautics.
2. Primary FDO responsibilities are:
 - a. Determining the Award Fee earned for each evaluation period as addressed in Part IV of this plan.
 - b. Approving changes to this Award-Fee Evaluation Plan as addressed in Part V.

2. Performance Evaluation Board (PEB)

1. The Chair of the PEB is the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) for the subject Contract. The following are voting members on the PEB:

Assistant Chief for Simulation Facilities, Aviation Systems Division
Chief, Aerospace Simulation Operations Branch
Chief, Aviation Operation Systems Development Branch
VAMS Project Manager
Contracting Officer (CO) for the subject Contract

2. The Chair may recommend the appointment of non-voting members to assist the PEB in performing its functions.
3. Primary responsibilities of the PEB are:
 - a. Conducting periodic evaluations of contractor performance and the submission of a Performance Evaluation Board Report (PEBR) to the FDO covering the Board's findings and recommendations for each evaluation period, as addressed in Part IV.
 - b. Considering changes in this plan and recommending those it determines appropriate for adoption to the FDO for approval, as addressed in Part V.

3. Contract and CTO Performance Monitors

1. The Contract and CTOs will be monitored and evaluated by a Contract and CTO Performance Monitor respectively. The Performance Monitor assignment will be made by the Responsible Organizational Manager (Chief, Aerospace Simulation Operations Branch).
2. Each Performance Monitor will be responsible for complying with the General Instructions for Contract and Contract Task Order Performance Monitors, Attachment IV-B, and any specific instructions of the COTR as addressed in Part IV of this Award-Fee Evaluation Plan. Primary Performance Monitor responsibilities are:
 - a. Monitoring, evaluating and assessing Contractor performance in assigned areas.
 - b. Prepare a Performance Monitor Report for the PEB or others as appropriate.
 - c. Recommending appropriate changes in this Award-Fee Evaluation Plan for consideration, as addressed in Part V.
3. The COTR will ensure that each Performance Monitor:
 - a. Receives a copy of this Award-Fee Evaluation Plan along with any changes made in accordance with Part V.
 - b. Receives appropriate orientation and guidance.
 - c. Receives specific instructions defining the Performance Monitors' assigned performance areas.
 - d. Submits monthly evaluations of the Contractor's performance.
4. Performance Monitors will evaluate and assess Contractor performance and discuss the results with Contractor personnel as appropriate, in accordance with the General Instructions for Contract Task Order Performance Monitors, Attachment IV-B, and the specific instructions and guidance furnished by the COTR.

III. Evaluation Requirements

Applicable evaluation requirements are established in the attachments as indicated below:

Requirement	Attachment
Work Elements, Performance Evaluation Factors and Weighting Factors	III-A
Detail Work Element Descriptions	III-B
Grading Tables	III-C.1 & 2
Example Computation for the PEB Award Fee Performance Evaluation Score	III-D

- ❖ Attachments III-A contains Weighting Factors (in percent) for each Performance Evaluation Factor and each work area. Attachment III-A is utilized for the Award Fee evaluation.
- ❖ The Work Elements are described in more detail in Attachment III-B.
- ❖ Attachment III.C.1 presents the Grading Table used by each of the Performance Monitors and by the PEB to determine correlations between numerical ratings and adjective ratings. Attachment III-C.2 presents the Performance Evaluation Factor Grading Tables used by each Performance Monitor and by the PEB to determine numerical ratings associated with performance for each Performance Evaluation Factor and each relevant Work Element.
- ❖ Attachment III-D presents an example showing how the Award Fee Performance Evaluations are implemented.

The Weighting Factors presented in Attachment III-A and the grading tables presented in Attachments III-C.1 & 2 are quantifying devices for the evaluation process. Their sole purpose is to provide guidance for the Performance Monitors and the PEB in arriving at an assessment of the Award Fee ratings. Nevertheless, the FDO may set aside the findings and recommendations of the PEB and make a unilateral determination of the Award Fee ratings/awards for any given period.

Prior to the beginning of each Award Fee Evaluation Period, the Government will notify the Contractor of any changes in the Weighting Factor values presented in Attachment III-A.

Scores ranging from 0 to 100 as defined by the Grading Table (Attachments III-C.1 and III-C.2) will be developed by the PEB for each Performance Evaluation Area associated with each Work Element that has a non-zero Weighting Factor. The PEB performance evaluation score will be computed by multiplying each individual score by the associated Weighting Factor (converted from percent to decimal) and then summing all of the numbers in each table. An example showing this computation for the Award Fee Weighting Factors (Attachment III-A) is presented in Attachment III-D.

IV. Method for Determining Award Fee

The Contractor's performance will be evaluated using the Award Fee weighting factors within 30 days after the completion of each six-month evaluation period associated with the Contract. The Award Fee evaluation will result in the determination of an Award Fee payable after each six-month evaluation period.

The method to be followed in monitoring, evaluating and assessing Contractor performance during the period, as well as for determining the Award Fee is described below. Attachment IV-A summarizes the principal activities and schedules involved.

1. The COTR, with consent from the Responsible Organizational Manager, will ensure that a Performance Monitor is assigned for the contract and each CTO. Performance Monitors will be selected on the basis of their expertise relative to prescribed performance area emphasis. Normally, Performance Monitor duties will be in addition to, or an extension of, regular responsibilities. The COTR, with consent from the Responsible Organizational

Manager may change Performance Monitor assignments at any time without advance notice to the Contractor.

2. The PEB may request and obtain performance information from other units or personnel normally involved in observing Contractor performance, as appropriate.
3. The COTR and CO will meet at least monthly with the Contractor to discuss overall performance during the period. As requested by the COTR, Performance Monitors and other personnel involved in performance evaluations will attend the meeting and participate in discussions.
4. Semi-annually, as scheduled in Attachment IV-A, the PEB Chair will consider Performance Monitor Reports and other performance information it obtains and discuss the reports and information with Performance Monitors or other personnel, as appropriate and will summarize the Performance Monitors preliminary findings and recommendations for inclusion in the PEBR.
5. The Contractor will be allowed to submit a self-assessment of performance to the PEB in a written and/or oral format, as requested by the PEB Chair. This may be done prior to the end of the evaluation period but not later than 5 working days after the end of the period. Then the PEB may meet with the Contractor to discuss the board's preliminary findings and recommendations. As requested by the PEB Chair, the COTR, CO, Performance Monitors and other personnel involved in performance evaluation will attend the meeting and participate in discussions. After meeting with the Contractor, the PEB will consider matters presented by the Contractor and finalize its findings and recommendations for the PEBR.
6. The PEB Chair will prepare the PEBR for the review period and submit it to the FDO for use in determining the Award Fee earned. The report will include separate recommended adjective ratings and performance scores with supporting documentation for the Award Fee.
7. The FDO will consider the PEBR and discuss it with the PEB Chair and other personnel, as appropriate. The FDO may also request additional information or comments from the Contractor.
8. Decisions reached by the FDO regarding the Award Fee amount earned (if any) and the basis for these decisions will be stated in the Award-Fee Determination Report (AFDR) which will be submitted to the CO no later than 10 days after the submission of the PEBR to the FDO or 30 days after the end of the evaluation period.
9. The FDO or CO may inform the Contractor of his/her decision prior to the execution of the Award Fee Contract modifications.
10. The CO will execute a unilateral modification to the Contract, providing the amount of Award Fee earned and the "standard" language to allow payment of the Award Fee and extension of the period of performance based on the modification without submittal of a voucher. No numerical or adjective ratings will be stated. The CO will forward the modification, along with a copy of the PEBR, to the Contractor.

V. Changes in Plan Coverage

1. Right to Make Unilateral Changes

This plan may be changed unilaterally by the FDO prior to the beginning of an evaluation period by timely notice through the CO to the Contractor in writing.

2. Changes in Plan Coverage

The principal actions involved in changing the coverage associated with this Performance Evaluation Plan [actions may be modified to reflect different approval/notification levels].:

1. Personnel involved in the administration of the Award Fee provisions of the Contract are encouraged to recommend plan changes with a view toward changing management emphasis, motivating higher performance levels or improving the Award Fee determination process. Recommended changes should be sent to the PEB for consideration and drafting.
2. Thirty days prior to the end of each evaluation period, the PEB will submit its recommended changes, if any, applicable to the next evaluation period for approval by the FDO with appropriate comments and justification.
3. At least 5 working days before the beginning of each evaluation period, the Contracting Officer will notify the Contractor in writing of any changes to be applied during the next evaluation period.

The PEB will establish lists of subsidiary actions and schedules as necessary to meet the above schedules.

ATTACHMENT III-A

Contract No. NNA TBD with TBD

AWARD FEE EVALUATION

WORK ELEMENTS, PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTORS AND WEIGHTING FACTORS

(Management and Directed Outreach; Small Business Utilization; Simulator Maintenance, Operation, Fabrication and Engineering; Experiment and ATC Development and Operations)

AWARD FEE WEIGHTING FACTORS	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTORS (in %)			
WORK ELEMENTS 1, 2, 3 and 4 (see Attachment III-B)	Technical Performance	Timeliness / Schedule	Admin/ Safety/ Environment/ Subcontracting	Cost
Management and Directed Outreach	10			5
Small Business Utilization	15			5
Simulator Maintenance, Operation, Fabrication and Engineering	20			10
Experiment and ATC Development and Operations	30			5

ATTACHMENT III-B

Contract No. NNA TBD with TBD

Detailed Work Element No. 1: Management and Directed Outreach

Based on the metrics included in Attachment III-C.1, the Contractor will be evaluated on how well they perform, management, administration and outreach efforts as described in the SOW Section 3.5.1. and 3.5.2., property management (Section 3.5.3), Safety, Environmental, and Mission Assurance (SEMA) (Section 3.5.4). The Contractor will also be evaluated on their responsiveness to the Contracting Officer (CO) and Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR), their management of subcontracts. The timeliness and quality of deliverables, such as reports, will also be evaluated. The Contractor is expected to ensure that adequate resources are available and allocated within the established budgetary constraints to meet the goals and missions of the Flight Simulation Laboratories.

Detailed Work Element No. 2: Small Business Utilization

Based on the metrics included in Attachment III-C.1, the contractor's performance shall be evaluated against the subcontracting plan incorporated in the contract with emphasis placed on the contractor's accomplishment of its goals for subcontracting with small business, HUBZone small business, women-owned small business, veteran-owned small business, and service-disabled veteran-owned small business concerns.

The contractor's achievements in subcontracting high technology efforts as well as the contractor's performance under the Mentor-Protégé Program, will be evaluated also, if applicable.

Detailed Work Element No. 3: Simulator Maintenance, Operation, Fabrication and Engineering

The effectiveness of the Contractor's overall simulation hardware and software systems, operation, development, fabrication, integration and maintenance will be evaluated on the basis of the performance metrics included in Attachment III-D.2. The Contractor will also be evaluated on their ability to provide system hardware engineering, development, integration, operation, maintenance, systems software and computer operations support for all of the simulators and related support equipment within the Simulation Laboratories (SimLabs) as described in SOW Section 3.3 and the successful FAA Level D recertification of the NASA 747-400 Simulator (Section 3.5.6). The Contractor is expected to take responsibility for all SimLabs simulators and peripheral equipment. This requires that the Contractor take a leadership position on all subjects affecting these systems, maintaining them, operating them and recommending improvements to them as if they were Contractor owned. The Contractor shall stay abreast of simulation technology advancements and recommend implementation in subject facilities where applicable.

The Contractor's engineering/fabrication abilities will be evaluated ranging from simple items requiring less than a day to sketch and fabricate, to more complex assemblies requiring one or more months of engineering, and fabrication. Schedule requirements will be specified in the authorizing work orders. Additionally, the Contractor shall be evaluated on their ability to provide immediate response for engineering design and repair of any unforeseen component/system failure. Build-up and preparation of cabs fall under this category. Participation and leadership of discrete projects fall under this category. The contractor's ability to successfully perform these tasks will be evaluated.

Operations include providing Hybrid and Digital Operators and VMS electronic technicians for the operation of the subject facilities whenever they are scheduled. Operation of the various simulators and simulation resources is outlined in yearly simulator schedules provided by the respective NASA Facility Manager and in the weekly computer schedules.

System software includes the development and maintenance of simulation computer operating systems and real-time executives. The contractor's ability to successfully perform these tasks will be evaluated.

The Contractor's ability to perform preventative and corrective maintenance will also be evaluated. All preventive and corrective maintenance work to be performed, scheduling intervals, etc. are defined in OEM and SimLabs procedural documentation. Coordination of the maintenance with NASA Facility Manager's is required to ensure optimum support of research activities performed in the various simulators.

Detailed Work Element No. 4:

Experiment and ATC Development and Operations

The effectiveness of the Contractor's overall experiment and ATC development and operations will be evaluated on the basis of the performance metrics included in Attachment III-D.2. The Contractor's technical performance shall also be evaluated based on their ability to develop and execute simulation experiments and allied projects in accordance with sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the SOW. This includes the support of simulation and graphics applications engineering as well. All tasks related to this Work Element will be in the form of Work Orders.

ATTACHMENT III-C.1

Contract No. NNA TBD with Contractor TBD

AWARD FEE GRADING TABLE

This table will be used to equate adjective ratings to performance scores for the overall performance of the Contractor. The descriptions should be used by the PEB to ensure that the rating is consistent with the Government's overall assessment of the Contractor's performance.

Adjective Rating	Rating/Score	Description
Excellent	(100-91)	Contractor has <u>exceeded almost all</u> of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. (See Attachment III-C.2 for more detailed description.)
Very Good	(90-76)	Contractor has <u>exceeded many</u> of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. (See Attachment III-C.2 for more detailed description.)
Good	(75-51)	Contractor has <u>exceeded some</u> of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. (See Attachment III-C.2 for more detailed description.)
Satisfactory	(50)	Contractor has <u>met</u> overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. (See Attachment III-C.2 for more detailed description.)
Unsatisfactory	(less than 50)	Contractor has <u>failed</u> to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. (See Attachment III-C.2 for more detailed description.)

Any work element receiving a grade of “unsatisfactory” (less than 50) will be assigned zero performance points for purposes of calculating the total award fee amount. In addition, the contractor will not be paid any award fee when the total award fee score is "Unsatisfactory" (less than 50).

The following table (Attachment III-C.2) is used to determine ratings for each Performance Evaluation area, as it relates to each relevant Work Element, which in turn relates to the Statement of Work. Attachment III-C.2 is a general guideline used in conjunction with the Award Fee performance evaluation process. These standards will be used by Performance Monitors to rate the Contractor's performance in meeting the requirements from the SOW for their assigned area(s). Typical indicators may include customer surveys and customer satisfaction ratings but will not be deemed as the sole input data source.

CO	Contracting Officer
COTR	Contracting Officer's Technical Representative
PM	Performance Monitor

ATTACHMENT III-C.2

Contract No. NNA TBD with TBD

Award Fee Performance Evaluation Factor Grading Table

(Management and Directed Outreach; Small Business Utilization; Simulator Maintenance, Operation, Fabrication and Engineering; Experiment and ATC Development and Operations)

Outcome/Standard	Poor/Unsatisfactory Performance	Very Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Surveillance Method
Technical Performance				
Management of resources (staffing and training) to accomplish mission goals.	Staffing and/or skill mix not able to accomplish mission goals	Staffing and/or skill mix able to accomplish mission goals.	Staffing and/or skill mix able to accomplish mission goals in an exemplary manner.	Input from PMs, adherence to staffing and training plans, customer survey information
Support to Successful directed outreach effort	Ineffective Technical support in promoting SimLabs to new users.	Technical support in promoting SimLabs to new users demonstrates success with new business prospects generated.	Technical support in proactively promoting SimLabs to new users with the establishment of a business relationship.	Audits, CO evaluation, input from PMs

Outcome/Standard	Poor/Unsatisfactory Performance	Very Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Surveillance Method
Technical Performance				
Provide high quality research customer service	Research data does not meet negotiated criteria	Research data meets negotiated criteria	Research data exceeds negotiated criteria and contractor performs in an exemplary manner	Input from PMs & customer survey information
Maximize research facility availability	Research facility downtime traceable to contractor performance resulting in significant delays that impact operations or research data.	Research facility downtime traceable to contractor performance resulting in minor delays that do not impact operations or research data.	No unscheduled research facility downtime traceable to contractor performance	Input from PMs; Monthly technical status meetings; Test operations logs
Efficient facility operation & maintenance	Contractor research facility maintenance approach results in downtime and /or avoidable repair costs.	Contractor maintenance approach results in research facilities being 100% available and reliable for all scheduled projects.	Contractor maintenance approach results in research facilities being 100% available and reliable for all scheduled projects along with reduced maintenance costs.	Input from PMs and facility occupants, Contractor data
Accurate & complete engineering documents	Engineering documents are incomplete and/or contain inaccuracies.	Engineering documents satisfy all project goals for completeness and accuracy.	Engineering documents exceed project goals for completeness and accuracy.	Audit reports; input from CPMs and customer survey information.
Meet project performance goals & objectives	Performance objectives for the evaluation period marginally met	Performance objectives for the evaluation period satisfied	Performance objectives for the evaluation period are exceeded.	Input from PMs; customer survey information
Configuration management / software and hardware configuration control	Incomplete documentation of any project requiring configuration management and/or lack of configuration management control	Complete documentation of all projects requiring configuration management including but not limited to the Ames Mgmt. System documents.	Complete documentation of all projects requiring configuration management including but not limited to the Ames Mgmt. System documents with no corrective actions found during audits.	Input from PMs; Monthly technical status meetings; Test operations logs, Ames Mgmt. System audits.

Outcome/Standard	Poor/Unsatisfactory Performance	Very Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Surveillance method
Timeliness/Schedule				
All management reporting and documentation completed on time	Management reports not completed on time. Reports / documentation submitted late.	Management reports and documentation completed on time.	Management reports and documentation completed on time or ahead of schedule and in an exemplary manner.	Inputs from COTR and CO
Successful directed outreach effort	Directed outreach tasks completed with significant delays relative to negotiated schedule.	Directed outreach tasks completed with minor delays that do not impact goals and objectives.	Directed outreach tasks completed on time or ahead of schedule.	Inputs from COTR and SimLabs management
Negotiated research test and project schedules are met	Research tests and projects completed with significant delays relative to negotiated test schedules.	Research tests and projects completed with minor delays that do not impact goals and objectives.	All research tests and projects completed on time or ahead of negotiated test schedules	Customer survey information, input from PMs

Outcome/Standard	Poor/Unsatisfactory Performance	Very Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Surveillance Method
Administrative / Safety / Environment / Small Business Utilization				
Utilization of OSHA, VPP or equivalent third party program to evaluate comprehensive and effective safety, health and environmental program.	Safety, health & environmental audits indicate non-compliance. Third party evaluation indicates the Contractor is noncompliant with OSHA / VPP or equivalent standards	Safety, health & environmental audits indicate minor non-compliance. Third party evaluation indicates Contractor has minor findings, which are easily corrected.	Safety, health & environmental audits indicate full compliance. Contractor achieves VPP Star Certification or the equivalent	Quarterly and monthly accident and injury reports, input from PMs. Input from ARC safety and environmental checks.

Outcome/Standard	Poor/Unsatisfactory Performance	Very Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Surveillance Method
Administrative / Safety / Environment / Small Business Utilization				
Effective global administrative systems (e.g. purchasing, subcontracting, Government property control, time & attendance)	Audits reveal issues with contractor administrative systems. Contractor responsible for missing government property.	Audits reveal minor issues with administrative systems that are immediately corrected. Missing government property is accounted for within 1 day.	Audits reveal no issues with administrative systems. Contractor can account for all government property and its proper maintenance in a manner that improves efficiency. Contractor continually evaluates morale to anticipate and prevent personnel problems.	Audits, CO evaluation, input from PMs
Successful support to directed outreach effort	Contact database not properly maintained. Support in promoting SimLabs to new users not provided. No new SimLabs business.	Contact database properly maintained with only minor errors identified. Support in promoting SimLabs to new users provided with new business prospects.	Contact database properly maintained with no errors. Support in promoting SimLabs to new users provided with new business obtained.	Audits, CO evaluation, input from PMs
Meeting Small Business subcontracting goals while maintaining efficient contract performance.	Subcontracting goals not met due to lack of effort by the Contractor	Subcontracting goals met by the Contractor	Subcontracting goals are exceeded by the Contractor. Contractor has strived to give work in highly technical areas to small businesses	Small Business Reports (iSRS), CO evaluation SBS evaluation
Achievement in subcontracting high technology efforts and participation in Mentor-Protégé Program	Subcontracting high technology goals are not met due to lack of effort by the Contractor and Contractor does not participate in Mentor-Protégé Program	Subcontracting High Technology Goals have been met and Contractor participates in the NASA Mentor-Protégé program	Subcontracting High Technology Goals have been exceeded and Contractor proactively participates in the NASA Mentor-Protégé program	Small Business Reports, CO evaluation SBS evaluation
Zero workplace mishaps	Injury or near miss due to contractor not following safety procedures.	No injuries or mishaps. All safety procedures followed.	No injuries or mishaps. Personnel exhibit safety-conscious attitude throughout the workplace	Quarterly and monthly accident and injury reports, input from PMs. Input from ARC safety and environmental checks.

Outcome/Standard	Poor/Unsatisfactory Performance	Very Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Surveillance Method
Administrative / Safety / Environment / Small Business Utilization				
Effective administration (e.g. purchasing, subcontracting, Government property control, time & attendance)	Administrative systems & processes do not satisfactorily meet requirements. Personnel frequently absent from work—major disruption in operations.	Administrative systems & processes meet requirements. Personnel occasionally absent from work—minor disruption in operations.	Administrative systems & processes exceed requirements. Personnel absences (if any) do not disrupt operations.	Audits, CO evaluation, input from PMs

Outcome/Standard	Poor/Unsatisfactory Performance	Very Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Surveillance method
Cost				
Effective cost control and reduction effort across entire contract.	Technical effort completed with cost overruns.	Technical effort costs meet or are within the negotiated cost.	Technical effort costs meet or are within the negotiated cost while delivering best value performance	Cost reports and input from PM's
All management effort, completed within budget	Management effort completed with cost over runs.	Management costs meet or are within the negotiated cost.	Management costs meet or are within the negotiated cost while delivering best value performance.	Inputs from COTR and CO
Successful support to directed outreach effort	Directed outreach costs exceed negotiated budget.	Directed outreach costs meet or are within the budgeted cost.	Directed outreach costs meet or are within the budgeted cost while delivering best value performance	Cost reports, input from PMs & SimLabs schedule
Accurate cost reporting.	Cost data is not timely and contains major inaccuracies.	Cost data is timely and contains easily correctable errors.	Cost data is provided prior to due date and contains no errors.	Cost reports and input from PM's

Note: Cost Overruns are not acceptable. The government cannot commit money it does not have. Satisfactory performance is no cost overrun.

Left Blank Intentionally

ATTACHMENT III-D

Contract No. NNA TBD with TBD

EXAMPLE COMPUTATION FOR THE PEB AWARD FEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SCORE

The following shows an example of how the PEB will compute the PEB Award Fee performance evaluation score using the Weighting Factors in Attachment III-A and a hypothetical set of scores for each area being evaluated.

Weighting Factors From Attachment III-A	Performance Evaluation Factors				
WORK ELEMENTS 1, 2, 3 and 4 (see Attachment III-B)	Technical Performance	Timeliness/ Schedule	Admin/ Safety/ Environment/ Subcontracts	Cost	Subtotals
Management and Directed Outreach	88X0.10			88X0.05	13.2
Small Business Utilization	50X.15			50x.05	10.0
Simulator Maintenance, Operation, Fabrication and Engineering,	90X0.20			90X0.10	31.5
Experiment and ATC Development and Operations	85X0.30			90X0.05	42.75
Subtotals	59.80			12.50	87.45

PEB Award Fee Performance Evaluation Score = 72.30

ATTACHMENT IV-A

Contract No. TBD with TBD

ACTIONS AND SCHEDULES FOR AWARD FEE DETERMINATIONS

The following is a summary of the principal actions and timeline requirements associated with determining the Award Fee ratings/awards for each evaluation period.

Action	Schedule Requirement (Calendar days)
1. PEB Chair and members appointed	5 days after approval of Award Fee Plan
2. PEB Chair appoints Performance Monitors and informs Contractor	5 days after approval of PEB
3. Performance Monitors receive orientation and guidance	15 days after approval of PEB
4. Performance Monitors assess performance and discuss results with Contractor	Ongoing
5. Performance Monitors submit Performance Monitor Reports to PEB	5 days prior to the end of each semi-annual Performance Evaluation period
6. PEB considers Performance Monitor Reports and other requested performance information	Ongoing
7. PEB discusses overall performance with Contractor	7 days after end of each month
8. The Contractor may submit a self-evaluation report	1-5 days after end of six-month period
9. PEB meets and summarizes preliminary findings and position of PEBR	10 days after end of six-month period
10. PEB Chair summarizes findings and recommendations for PEBR	15 days after end of six-month period
11. PEB Chair submits PEBR to FDO	20 days after end of six-month period
12. FDO considers PEBR and discusses with PEB, as appropriate	25 days after end of six-month period
13. FDO sends determination to CO; CO sends PEBR to Contractor; CO issues modification	NLT 30 days after end of six-month period
14. Payment made to Contractor based on Contract modification	NLT 45 days after end of six-month period

The PEB will establish lists of subsidiary actions and schedules as necessary to meet the above schedules.

ATTACHMENT IV-B

Contract No. TBD with TBD

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONTRACT AND TASK ORDER PERFORMANCE MONITORS

1. Monitoring and Assessing Performance

- a. Performance Monitors will prepare outlines of their assessment plans; and discuss them with appropriate Contractor personnel to assure complete understanding of the evaluation and assessment process.
- b. Performance Monitors will plan and carry out on-site assessment visits, as necessary.
- c. Performance Monitors will conduct all assessments in an open, objective and cooperative spirit so that a fair and accurate evaluation is obtained. This will ensure that the Contractor receives accurate and complete information from which to plan improvements in performance. Positive performance accomplishments should be emphasized just as readily as negative ones.
- d. Performance Monitors will discuss the performance assessment with Contractor personnel as appropriate, noting any observed accomplishments and/or deficiencies. This affords the Contractor an opportunity to clarify possible misunderstandings regarding areas of poor performance and to correct or resolve deficiencies.
- e. Performance Monitors must remember that contacts and visits with Contractor personnel are to be accomplished within the context of official contractual relationships. Performance Monitors will avoid any activity or association, which might cause, or give the appearance of, a conflict of interest.
- f. Performance Monitor discussions with Contractor personnel are not to be used as an attempt to instruct, to direct, to supervise or to control these personnel in the performance of the Contract. The role of the Performance Monitor is to monitor, assess and evaluate not to manage the Contractor's effort.

2. Documenting Evaluation/Assessment

Evaluations and assessments conducted and discussions with Contractor personnel will be documented as follows:

1. Evaluation/Assessment Reports

Performance Monitors will prepare a written Performance Monitor Report in accordance with the instructions given by the COTR and submit the subject report to the PEB.

2. Verbal Reports

Performance Monitors should be prepared to make verbal reports presenting their evaluations and assessments as required by the PEB Chair.